DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 149 387 CS 501 908

AUTHOR Foss, Sonja K.
TITLE The Fantasy Theme Analysis Approach to the Rhetorical Criticism of Social Movements: An Evaluation.
PUB DATE Nov 77
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association (Phoenix, Arizona, November 20-23, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Analytical Criticism; *Communication (Thought Transfer); *Discourse Analysis; Evaluation Methods; *Organizational Communication; *Organizations (Groups); Rhetorical Criticism; *Social Change
IDENTIFIERS *Fantasy Theme Analysis

ABSTRACT

"Fantasy-theme analysis" suggests that the individual and collective dramatizations of a group's goals, scope, and activities--the group's conceptualized reality, or fantasy theme--can be used to study social movements. Based on the notion of fantasizing in small groups, this analytic approach provides a method of discovering how communication creates social realities for groups of people. This paper examines seven assumptions that underlie fantasy-theme analysis and finds that the method cannot do all that it purports to do; often it does not meet accepted criteria for sound historical research and rhetorical criticism. Suggestions are made that would correct the method's inadequacies, making it an effective tool in the study of social movements from a rhetorical perspective. (RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

The Fantasy Theme Analysis Approach to the Rhetorical Criticism of Social Movements: An Evaluation

By

Sonja K. Foss
Department of Performing Arts and Communications
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia
24061

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sonja K. Foss

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED149387

CS501908

Ernest G. Bormann has proposed an approach to the rhetorical study of social movements that he calls a fantasy theme analysis.[1] Based on Robert Bales' notion of fantasizing in small groups, Bormann's system provides a method of discovering how communication creates social realities for groups of people. Central to the method are the concepts of "fantasy" and "rhetorical vision."

A fantasy, according to Bormann, is a dramatization of a hypothetical or actual situation. It includes a recollection of something that happened in the past to the group, a reflection of the group's present situation and its relationship to the external environment, and a dream of what the group might do in the future. A fantasy chain is set up in a group when a participant communicates symbols that relate either to the group's here-and-now problems or to the individual psychodynamics of the participants. Such communications, which cause the members of a group to empathize, to improvise on the same theme, or to respond emotionally, form fantasies that tend to be played out in a more and more complete way until they reflect the members' common preoccupations and serve to make those commonalities public.

Bormann's concept of rhetorical vision exterds the fantasy chain to encompass a movement. Rhetorical vision is the term he gives to the composite dramas which catch up large groups of people in a particular symbolic reality. Just as fantasy chains create a unique culture within a small group, so the

fantasy themes of campaigns and movements chain out in public audiences to form a rhetorical vision. When group members wish to convert others to their position, they create messages for public speeches, the media, and literature, shaping the fantasy themes that excited them in their original discussions into suitable form for various public audiences. The drama created by this public rhetoric draw in members of the audience, transporting them to the same symbolic reality held by the small group. These audience members then take up the dramas in small groups of their acquaintances, and some of these dramas chain out as fantasy themes in the new groups. The process continues to reach a larger public audience until a rhetorical/social movement emerges.

Bormann argues that the critic can make a useful contribution to the understanding of a movement by examining the particular reality that is contained in its rhetorical vision. He suggests that the critic engaging in a fantasy theme analysis proceed by (1) collecting evidence related to the manifest content of the communication, (2) looking for patterns or fantasy themes in the communication, and (3) reconstructing the rhetorical vision from the fantasy themes. Since Bormann suggested the method in 1972, the fantasy theme approach has been used in the study of several movements. Bormann himself used the method to analyze the Eagleton affair during the 1972 presidential election campaign,[2] while his students examined other aspects of this campaign.[3] The method also was used by Virginia Kidd to analyze interpersonal relations in popular magazines[4] and in dissertations on the Virginia convention of 1788,[5] the Cold War,[6] and the Equal Rights Amendment.[7]

Since the fantasy theme method has been applied by critics to study various movements, it now should be evaluated in an attempt to determine

if it accomplishes what it purports to accomplish and if it meets the criteria for sound historical research and rhetorical criticism. To evaluate a method such as the fantasy theme analysis, one must examine the underlying assumptions of the method. The fantasy theme approach appears to be based on seven fundamental assumptions gleaned from Bormann's original description of the method. Each of these assumptions will be examined and evaluated.

Assumption 1: The basic question that the method seeks to answer is legitimate and adequate in order to study the rhetoric of a movement.

Historians recognize the importance of the question-asking process in research; a question enables the critic to formulate the specific focus of the study. Although Bormann does not explicitly state the question that he seeks to answer through the fantasy theme approach to criticism, it seems to be: "What fantasy themes constitute the rhetorical vision of the participants in a movement?"

The question seems to be legitimate and adequate in that it meets basic criteria for a proper historical question.[8] It is operational or can be resolved in the empirical terms of discursive themes with certain characteristics. It is open-ended, but is still narrow enough to guide the critic through masses of data. That is, it dictates that the answer to the question will be found in the designation of fantasy themes, but it does not suggest the characteristics the themes will manifest. Finally, the question that is asked should allow the researcher to ask more and more questions in the attempt to answer the starting question. That Bormann's question meets this criterion is evident in his proposal of several questions that could be used to investigate the rhetorical vision of a movement such as, "Who are the heroes and the villains?" "Where are the dramas set?" "What are the typical

scenarios?" and "What lifestyles are exemplified as praiseworthy?"[9]

From a strictly historical perspective, then, Bormann's question appears to be legitimate and adequate. The rhetorical critic may be uneasy, however, about the question because of its limited scope. That is, the question focuses on a very limited number of the many components of a movement. For example, the question does not allow the critic to examine elements such as various types of discourse in a movement, the function of leaders in a movement, or the arguments offered by the participants in a movement and their impact on the public audience. Thus, while the question asked in a fantasy theme analysis meets the criteria for a good historical question, it is inadequate for the study of a social movement in that it seems to neglect important components of movements.

Assumption 2: The function of rhetorical criticism is to understand or gain increased awareness of the rhetorical experience being studied.

The function of rhetorical criticism that is assumed in the fantasy theme method is to "come to a new understanding" of the movement being studied or "to be in possession" of the experience."[10] This process of understanding seems to involve simply entering into the experience as fully as possible to gain insights into its nature. Bormann explains that as a result of a fantasy theme analysis, we "come vicariously to experience a way of life that would otherwise be less accessible to us, we have enlarged our awareness, we have become more fully human." He concludes that "the discovery and appreciation of rhetorical visions should be one possible function of criticism."[11]

The re-living or experiencing of a particular phenomenon is not, however, an adequate function of rhetorical criticism. Rather, rhetorical criticism should function to contribute to the development of rhetorical

theory. Bowers explains this function of rhetorical criticism by suggesting that it should contribute to the formulation of "statements accounting for the origins and effects of all rhetorical discourses in all contexts."[12] Rhetorical criticism, then, should function to contribute to the development of rhetorical theory by proposing and testing hypotheses concerning, for example, the way rhetoric operates in all social movements. Admittedly, Bormann may have had increased theoretical understanding in mind when he stated the purposes and functions of his method, but the notion that an awareness of a particular phenomenon can lead to a generalization or theory about all such phenomena is only implicit at best.

Because the fantasy theme method as employed by Bormann and others does not point to the development of rhetorical theory, it contains other deficiencies. Whereas rhetorical criticism that has theory development as an aim would provide support for a particular position or for the existence of a rhetorical principle,[13] the fantasy theme method tends to simply describe. The studies that have been completed using this method neither argue nor provide support for conclusions, but instead rely on narration as the primary mode of presentation. Bormann's study of the Eagleton affair, for example, contains little analysis; it consists instead of a narration of the events that occurred, including the presentations of the media and the actions of the participants. In this type of fantasy theme study, rhetorical analysis is sacrificed to the telling of a story. Ferguson's examination of consumer communication in the 1972 presidential campaign,[14] on the other hand, is more analytical in that it extracts eight fantasy themes from discourse, including "Nixon the Diplomat" and "McGovern the Man of the People." But no support is provided to convince the reader that these themes actually do exist in the discourse. Fischer suggests that a

historian must not merely tell truths, but must demonstrate their truthfulness as well,[15] a process that is missing from most of the studies that employ this method.

The need for evidence to support the existence of particular fantasy themes in a movement, however, poses a technical problem for the critic. If he or she provides examples of fantasy themes from discourse to prove to the reader that the analysis is correct, the study tends to become an enumeration of themes followed by chains of examples. This form may be likened to a form that Collingwood labels "scissors-and-paste history."[16]

The fantasy theme method as described by Bormann, then, is not adequate as a method of rhetorical criticism because its stated goal leads to the compilation of a mass of information about the rhetorical vision of a group of individuals. It can say little about the general operation of rhetoric in social movements except that in one specific movement, certain rhetorical characteristics are evident. This lack of an orientation toward theory development tends to be accompanied by either a narrative, non-analytical presentation or by analysis with little supporting evidence. Admittedly, the method does not have to be constrained by these limitations. Critics that have employed the approach thus far, however, seem to have stopped short of utilizing the full potential of the fantasy theme method as it applies to the development of rhetorical theory.

Assumption 3: The rhetoric generated by the participants in a movement represents sound evidence of their interpretations of a situation.

Historians caution against the use of documents, or the written records of individuals, as evidence of the nature of events or of intentions on the part of the participants in some event or activity. They realize that a discrepancy may exist between the rhetoric of the document and the reality of

the situation. The goals, purposes, and desires expressed in a document may not represent the actual intentions of the individuals, but rather ones professed to hide their real intentions. And even if the documents express real intentions, these cannot always be interpreted as real causes behind certain actions. The historian is likely to conclude, if this questioning of documents is extended far enough, that they can reveal only what individuals thought they thought.

If discourse never is to be accepted at face value and can provide the historian only with a limited amount of information, must the fantasy theme approach be condemned because it relies almost totally on the discourse of documents? Fortunately, the answer is negative, for the dependence of the fantasy theme analysis on documents generally is an asset rather than a hindrance to the attainment of its goals. For what individuals thought they thought is precisely what is important to the rhetorical critic engaged in a fantasy theme analysis of a movement. Since the main focus of the method is on the reality for the participant as generated by discourse, the rhetorical critic is little interested in whether a document or a piece of discourse matches reality or reveals an individual's true intentions. Whether or not participants' symbolic communication is a complete guide to the inner states of the actors is irrelevant to the fantasy theme analysis since the actual discourse is viewed as a sufficient clue to the motivations of the participants.

For the traditional historian, documents and discourse must be used cautiously to insure that an accurate picture of events, intentions, and values of a society is created. The fantasy theme critic, however, can feel more certain that documents provide what is sought--a picture of the social reality created by discourse for the participants.

Assumption 4: The social reality created by fantasy themes in a rhetorical vision unites participants in collective group behavior.

Historians generally distinguish between three types of group behavior: (1) collective, in which individuals possess a relatively similar interpretation of a situation and engage in concerted action as a group; (2) aggregative, in which individuals engage in separate activities of a like nature that are not consciously planned by a group; and (3) conjunctive, in which the conjunction of individual- or group-intended actions affect a society by the aggregate of their unintended consequences.[17] Essentially, then, the distinctions among these three types of groups revolve about whether the participants' aims are individual- or group-planned and whether the observer's view of the consequence of the group's actions is the same as the consequence intended by the group members.

The fantasy theme approach assumes that the participants in a rhetorical vision generated by particular fantasy themes represent a collective group--that is, that all who participate in the vision share a similar interpretation of the situation and act as a group to respond in the same ways to the vision. This assumption, however, does not allow the critic to discover possible differences in motives and behavioral manifestations in individuals as a result of the same rhetorical vision. The analyst may be forced to commit what Fischer terms the fallacies of composition and division.[18] In the fallacy of composition, the critic reasons improperly from a property of a member of a group to a property of the group itself; while in the fallacy of division, he or she reasons falsely from a quality of the group to a quality of a member of the group. Thus, the fantasy theme analyst may tend to see all opposition groups in a particular campaign as possessing similar characteristics because the characteristic is evident in one such group or may conclude

that because the opposition generally seems to hold a particular value, each group or individual in opposition similarly holds that value.

The committing of possible fallacies in research is not the only problem with a fantasy theme analysis as a result of its assumption that participants in a rhetorical vision act as a collective group. The critic employing this method is not forced to consider how membership in the group is defined, the degree of engagement of members of the group, the completeness of the group (the ratio of actual to potential members), the types and degrees of the group's cohesion, the extent and nature of interaction within the group, or the possible production of contradictory fantasy themes as a result of subgroups within a larger movement. Admittedly, the potential for discovering some of these types of information about a movement exists in the rhetoric generated by the movement's participants; thus, the method simply would need to be expanded to include these kinds of considerations.

Assumption 5: A rhetorical analysis of a social movement must consist of more than an analysis of its historical and social characteristics or its argumentation.

Rhetorical critics traditionally have studied social movements by examining their historical and social characteristics.[19] This format does not represent sufficient rhetorical study of a movement. Campbell explains that rhetorical critics should "reject historical and socio-psychological definitions of movements as the basis for rhetorical criticism on the grounds that they do not, in fact, isolate a genre of rhetoric of a distinctive body of rhetorical acts." She goes on to suggest that the "criteria defining a rhetorical movement must be rhetorical . . ."[20] An emphasis on the environmental or situational factors only in a social movement does not constitute such a rhetorical definition of a social movement.

If a movement is not studied from the perspective of its historical and social environment, it often is analyzed through the argumentation presented by the participants in the movement.[21] In this approach, critics study the various issues involved in the controversy. But a strictly argumentative approach to the movement is limiting; it ignores many rhetorical factors that affect and influence the movement and that perhaps are more significant than the arguments themselves in determining the outcome of a movement.

The fantasy theme approach to social movements represents a step toward an analysis of movements that is essentially rhetorical. The focus on discourse as the means to analyzing a movement does not limit the rhetorical critic to studying the movement within artifically- or externally-imposed boundaries of history or sociology such as events that may seem to have started the movement or people who may appear to be the leaders of the movement. In addition, because the method focuses on the total pattern of discourse involved in a movement, the critic can separate arguments from other themes that influence and affect the participants and the direction of the movement. The critic may discover, as a result, that what once were considered arguments actually are non-argumentative themes involving, for example, the setting for the reality or characterizations of the participants. Or the critic may discover that the arguments are the least important aspects of a movement in terms of its outcome. When the critic examines all aspects of the discourse--and not just its history or its argumentation--the limits provided by the discourse itself are the only boundaries. This reality may be more influential and important than any event or leader or argument in the movement in terms of motivating the participants, attracting new converts, and persuading the public audience.

Assumption 6: The motives of the participants in a movement reside in their discourse.

The fantasy theme approach to rhetorical criticism is based on the idea that motives in a movement reside not in individuals but in rhetoric. Bormann explains: "For the scholar, at any rate, to view motives as embedded in the rhetorical vision rather than hidden in the skulls and viscera of people makes it possible to check the critic's insights by going directly to the rhetoric rather than relying on inferences about psychological entities unavailable for analysis."[22] As a result of this view of the location of motives, Bormann predicts that the fantasy theme method will allow the critic greater power of prediction than other traditional methods of investigating motives such as a fixed checklist of motives that reside within individuals, for example, because the attribution of motives will be more verifiable.

If the determination of motives is one of the principal goals of the fantasy theme analysis of a movement, the method is surprisingly inadequate in providing a format for such a discovery. A lack of guidelines for the determination of motives results in the citation of a wide range of elements as motives in fantasy theme studies. In Bormann's analysis of the Eagleton affair, for example, the motives found embedded in the rhetoric include such elements as apathy and personal attachment to a person of high ethical character.[23] Ferguson's analysis of consumer communication in the same campaign conjoins emotions and motives into categories such as respect, pride, sympathy, fear, disgust, and inspiration.[24] Bantz' analysis of the rhetorical vision of the ABC evening news during a period of the campaign suggests a third alternative to the discovery of motives. He suggests that the motives in the drama are related to the ultimate legitimatizer, which he defines in the campaign as rational thought. McGovern's actions do not seem rational and his motives therefore are suspect. Nixon's actions on the other hand, appear rational,

and his motives, then, are acceptable.[25] Thus, in various fantasy theme analyses, the critics, supposedly discovering the motives in the rhetoric, have labeled as motives respect for a person, have fused motives with emotions, and have examined motives within candidates rather than in the participants involved in the drama. These represent three strikingly different approaches to the discovery of motives in discourse.

The apparent confusion over how to extract motives from discourse results from the lack of a model of motivation in the fantasy theme method. Motives well may be embedded in discourse, but the method does not delineate how the critic is expected to connect the actor's internal state with the discourse or how the discourse alone can produce certain impulses toward action. Is the method based on a model of drive and habit, for example, combining an inner physiological drive with previously learned habit? If so, the method tells nothing about the effects of discourse on habit, of the possibility of discourse as habit, or of how the physiological drive connects to discourse--whether it generates discourse or is generated by it. Is the underlying model one that views motivation as a disposition or tendency to do certain acts based on the probability of the repetition of similar behavior in the past? Is so, the method tells nothing about looking for evidence of recurring connections between discourse and actions. Similarly, analyses of motivation based on Kenneth Burke's pentad, Carl Jung's self-actualization, or Gordon Allport's functional autonomy[26] would require the asking of different questions to establish motives and the formulation of different guidelines to answer these questions. These examples of possible models of human behavioral motivation illustrate the void in the fantasy theme approach to the discovery of motives in discourse. Not only is a model of motivation missing, but guidelines for the use of such a model also are lacking.

Assumption 7: The traditional view of emotions in discourse as appeals to such feelings as fear, pity, and love is adequate to analyze emotions in a rhetorical vision.

In a method that seeks to examine the rhetorical vision of the participants in a movement and the interaction of the component parts as they function to create a social reality, the fantasy theme's treatment of emotions is simplistic and inadequate. Bormann and his students see emotions in the traditional sense of a strong feeling, without questioning whether this view of emotions is useful for their methodological approach to a movement's rhetoric. Thus, emotions evoked in movements studied through fantasy analysis include "admiration for a persona,"[27] "affection," "revulsion," "distrust," and "shame."[28]

Once again, as in the method's approach to motivation, the model on which the notion of emotional evocation from discourse is based is missing. The formulators of the method do not deal with issues such as whether emotions are a part of argumentation, whether emotions are tied to motivation, which fantasy themes provide clues to emotions, and in which themes the emotional components are the strongest. Simply to say that a particular rhetorical vision invokes the emotion of fear, as fantasy theme analysts seem to do, says little about how that emotion was selected from the discourse of the participants, how the legitimacy of the emotion is supported in the discourse, or how the emotion relates to the capacity of the rhetorical vision to create a reality.

The fantasy theme approach to the study of a movement is adequate and meets the criteria for good historical research and rhetorical criticism in the following dimensions:

(1) The rhetoric of the participants in a movement is a reliable clue to their particular social reality.

(2) A rhetorical analysis of a movement consists of more than an analysis of the historical and social environment of the movement or of its argumentation.

The method is deficient, however, in its reliance on five faulty assumptions:

(1) The question that is asked, "What fantasy themes constitute the rhetorical vision of the participants in a movement?" is inadequate in that it does not allow consideration of many of the essential components of a movement. A more adequate question that would focus on rhetoric and its interaction with other components of the movement might be: "How does the rhetoric generated in a movement combine with other aspects of the movement to create a social reality for the participants?"

(2) The function of rhetorical criticism is to understand or gain increased awareness of the rhetorical experience being studied. This function, which confines the end result of a fantasy theme study to increased personal fulfillment, could be corrected by extending the results of the fantasy analysis explicitly to general rhetorical theory. As a result of such a study, for example, the rhetorical critic should be able to say something about the nature of setting themes and their effect on the outcome of a social movement or to predict whether an emphasis on character themes in discourse hinders or helps the development of a movement. Another theoretical issue the fantasy theme analyst might confront is the type of tactics the participants in a movement should employ in their development of discourse to insure success with the public audience.

(3) The social reality created by fantasy themes in a rhetorical vision unites participants in collective group behavior. This assumption leads the fantasy theme analyst to assume that all who participate in a particular rhetorical vision share a similar interpretation of the situation and act as a group

to respond in the same ways to the vision. As a result, the rhetorical critic may gain a simplistic, inadequate, or inaccurate view of the participants in a movement. The method should include an examination of the nature of the groups and their participants in the movement using information other than an investigation of its rhetoric alone.

(4) The motives of the participants in a movement reside in their discourse. Although a critic may discover motives by examining discourse, the fantasy theme analyst needs to have in mind a basic model of human motivation before he or she can accomplish this task. For example, if the model chosen is a dispositional one which explains motives as dispositions to follow the practice common to a society, the critic then would look for evidence of recurrence of the link between particular patterns of discourse and particular actions in the society.

(5) The traditional view of emotions in discourse as appeals to such feelings as fear, pity, and love is adequate to analyze emotions in a rhetorical vision. A more satisfactory means of examining emotions might be Cronkhite's notion of emotional appeals as the value premises at the base of arguments--values to which an audience or participants must adhere if they are to accept the arguments presented.[29] This approach not only posits emotional appeal within a framework of the entire rhetorical vision by linking it directly and necessarily to other components of the rhetorical vision, but it tells how emotions are connected to discourse. It provides the model for the linkage by stating that emotions are value premises that must be believed by an audience if the advocate is to gain adherence for an argument.

An examination of the assumptions made in a fantasy theme approach to rhetorical criticism shows that the method cannot do all that it purports to and often does not meet accepted criteria for sound historical research and rhetorical criticism. The limitations that exist in the method, however, are

correctable, and the fantasy theme method represents a valuable contribution to the study of social movements. Hopefully, rhetorical critics will continue to experiment with the method and to improve upon it so that it will attain the goals it attempts to reach in the study of movements from a rhetorical perspective.

Notes

[1] Ernest G. Bormann, "Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision: The Rhetorical Criticism of Social Reality," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 58 (Dec. 1972), 396-407.

[2] Ernest G. Bormann, "The Eagleton Affair: A Fantasy Theme Analysis," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 59 (April 1973), 143-59.

[3] Moments in Contemporary Rhetoric and Communication, 2 (Fall 1972).

[4] Virginia Kidd, "Happily Ever After and Other Relationship Styles: Advice on Interpersonal Relations in Popular Magazines, 1951-1973," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 61 (Feb. 1975), 31-39.

[5] John Richard Breitlow, "Rhetorical Fantasy at the Virginia Convention of 1788," Diss. Univ. of Minnesota 1972.

[6] John Francis Cragan, "The Cold War Rhetorical Vision, 1946-1972," Dise. Univ. of Minnesota 1972.

[7] Sonja Kay Foss, "A Fantasy Theme Analysis of the Rhetoric of the Debate on the Equal Rights Amendment, 1970-1976: Toward a Theory of the Rhetoric of Movements," Diss. Northwestern Univ. 1976.

[8] For a discussion of criteria for good questions to ask in historical research, see David Hackett Fischer, Historians' Fallacies: Toward a Logic of Historical Thought (New York: Harper & Row, 1970), pp. 38-39.

[9] Borman, "Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision," pp. 401-02.

[10] Ibid., p. 405.

[11] Ibid., p. 407.

[12] John Waite Bowers, "The Pre-Scientific Function of Rhetorical Criticism," in Essays on Rhetorical Criticism, ed. Thomas R. Nilsen (New York: Random House, 1968), p. 127.

[13] For a discussion of the view that rhetorical criticism should include argument, see Wayne Brockriede, "Rhetorical Criticism as Argument," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 60 (April 1974), 165-74.

[14] Beverly Ferguson, "The Rhetorical Visions of the 1972 Campaign," Moments in Contemporary Rhetoric and Communication, 2 (Fall 1972), 38-44.

[15] Fischer, Historians' Fallacies, p. 40.

[16] R. G. Collingwood, The Idea of History (1946; rpt. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1974), p. 257.

[17]Robert F. Berkhofer, Jr., A Behavioral Approach to Historical Analysis (New York: Free Press, 1969), pp. 76-77.

[18]Fischer, Historians' Fallacies, pp. 219-22.

[19]Griffin's first proposal for the study of movements, for example, emphasizes their historical and social characteristics. See Leland M. Griffin, "The Rhetoric of Historical Movements," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 38 (April 1952), 184-88.

[20]Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, "The Rhetoric of Women's Liberation: An Oxymoron," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 59 (Feb. 1973), 74.

[21]Blahna's study of the campaign for the adoption of the Equal Rights Amendment, for example, consists of a discussion of arguments alone. See Loretta J. Blahna, "The Rhetoric of the Equal Rights Amendment," Diss. Univ. of Kansas 1973.

[22]Bormann, "Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision," p. 407.

[23]Bormann, "The Eagleton Affair," pp. 143, 145.

[24]Ferguson, "Rhetorical Visions, pp.38-40.

[25]Charles Bantz, "The Rhetorical Vision of the ABC Evening News," Moments in Contemporary Rhetoric and Communication, 2 (Fall 1972), 37.

[26]For a summary of the motivational theories of Jung and Allport and their relation to communication, see R. Barry Fulton, "Motivation: Foundation of Persuasion," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 49 (Oct. 1963), 295-307.

[27]Bormann, "The Eagleton Affair," p. 145.

[28]Ferguson, "Rhetorical Visions," pp. 38-44.

[29]Gary Lynn Cronkhite, "Logic, Emotion, and the Paradigm of Persuasion," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 50 (Feb. 1964), 13-18.